JPRS 76228

14 August 1980

Worldwide Report

LAW OF THE SEA

No. 127

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of thir publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS 76228

14 August 1980

WORLDWIDE REPORT

LAW OF THE SEA

No. 127

CONTENTS

LATIN AMERICA

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

WEST EUROPE

NEW ZEALAND ARRESTS SOVIET SHIP FOR CUTTING TRAWL LINE

Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 18 Jul 80 p 5

[Text] A Russian trawler was arrested in Port Chalmers yesterday.

The writ of arrest was served by the Sheriff of the High Court in Dunedin in its Admiralty in Court jurisdiction yesterday.

It is alleged that on May 29 the West German High Seas Fisheries NZ Ltd joint venture ship Wesermunde, and 16 Syezd were fishing in the same area on the Campbell Rise.

The Wesermunde's trawl caught on the sea floor.

Signal

The Wesermunde is said to have signalled a warning about this to the Russian trawler which, instead of taking evasive action, is reported to have cut across the Wesermunde's stern, cutting the trawl line.

Legal action was initiated through the High Court in Wellington in its Admiralty jurisdiction against the 16 Syezd and a writ was obtained.

The object is to recover the cost of the lost Wesermunde net and line, and associated costs involved in the Wesermunde having to put in to Wellington to secure a new steel trawl line and gear.

The Russian trawler is owned by V-O Sovryvflot of Moscow, but it is understood to be chartered by Fletcher-Sovryvflot Fishing Ltd for work in New Zealand waters.

The application for the writ was processed by a Wellington firm of barristers and solicitors, Izard Weston and Co. Their Dunedin agents, Darling Marquet and Co, took care of the action in Port Chalmers and Dunedin.

Two other Russian vessels have been arrested in incidents in New Zealand in the past 14 months.

On December 12 last year the trawler Sokolinoye was suspended for a month for using an undersized net near Campbell Island.

Earlier in the year, on June 8, the Dneprodyzerz-Minsk was escorted to Wellington by HMNZS Taranaki for using an undersized liner in its nets.

Other foreign fishing vessels arrested since January, 1979, are: March, Sheng Pao 27 (Taiwan), within limit; April, Tae Chang No 55 (Korea), within limit; May, Ming Shan (Taiwan), within limit; Taiyo Maru (Japan), within limit; July Nampyung No 5 (Korea), within limit; December, Cinco Oceanos No 152 (Korea), undersized nets; January, 1980, Fukuwa Maru No 1 (Japan), within limit; February, Diaren Maru No 21 (Japan), within limit.

CSO: 5200

BRIEFS

JAPAN'S CONCERN OVER U.S. BILL--Tokyo July 11 KYODO--Nobuo Imamura, director general of the Fisheries Agency, will leave for the United States Saturday to make representations over a move to bar foreign fishermen from the 200-mile U.S. exclusive zone. While in the United States, Imamura will meet with State Department officials and others concerned to demand withdrawal of a bill now before Congress. The bill, presented by Rep. John Breaux (D-La.), calls for restrictions on foreign fishing operations in the 200-mile exclusive zone and has aroused grave concern among Japanese fishermen, who are now allocated 60 percent of the total foreign catch quota in the zone. The bill has already been approved [by] the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and debate in the House is scheduled to begin late this month. Imamura may make some concessions on a U.S. demand for lower Japanese import duties on fishery products at the talks with U.S. officials, agency sources said. He is scheduled to return home July 20. [Text] [OW111111 Tokyo KYODO in English 1106 GMT 11 Jul 80]

CSO: 5200

PROGRESS REPORTED AT FISHING TALKS WITH ROK IN TOKYO

OW121245 Tokyo KYODO in English 1213 GMT 12 Jul 80

[Text] Tokyo July 12 KYODO--Japanese and South Korean Government delegates wound up negotiations Saturday after making what Foreign Ministry officials called a big step toward an early conclusion of an agreement on fishing of Alaska pollack by South Koreans in waters off Hokkaido. The two parties made substantial compromises at the two-day working-level meeting here, paving the way for early realization of South Korean trawl fishing off Hokkaido, the ministry officials said. The delegates agreed to resume the working-level talks in mid-July in Tokyo. They will also hold a top-level meeting in Seoul next month for early conclusion of the issue.

Acting Prime Minister Masayoshi Ito and South Korean Premier Pak Chung-hun agreed on an early settlement of the issue when they met in Tokyo last week when Pak visited Japan to attend the funeral of the late Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira.

Japan made a compromise plan Saturday to allow South Korean fishermen to catch fish in limited waters off Hokkaido in a certain period every year. On the other hand, the South Korean side said they are ready to accept Japan's compromise if Japan agrees with a South Korean plan to prohibit Japanese fishing in certain areas in waters off Cheju Island, south of the Korean Peninsula.

In the previous meeting last May Japan proposed a total ban on fishing by South Koreans in the Hokkaido area. South Korea turned down the proposed ban by saying it has the right to fish in the waters under a 1965 fishery agreement between the two nations. The South Koreans annually catch about 100,000 tons of Alaska pollack in the Japanese fishing zone.

CSO: 5200

MASTER PLAN FOR FISHING INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT BEING COMPILED

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 16 Jul 80 p 6

/Report by HERALD marine reporter Roy Vaughan/

/Text/ A master plan for the development of the New Zealand fishing industry is being compiled by the Fishing Industry Board. It spells out the value of the country's marine resources and the cost of exploiting deep waters.

The plan will be presented to the industry for discussion in about four weeks. It outlines the cost in cash, manpower and equipment which will have to be met if New Zealand boats take over from foreign joint-venture and licensed craft.

Local fishermen are looking for the sort of Government encouragement which was given to the then developing dairy industry in the 1930s.

This aim will mean a guarantee of financial support for the first few years or so of development because fishermen already appreciate that the risks and investments are too great for them to bear alone.

The industry has now progressed about as far as it can in inshore and near inshore waters. The next stage of development will be the most difficult, according to the board's general manager, Mr N. E. Jarman.

The development plan outlines future prospects and will try to offer the Government and industry advice on expansion moves.

Local fishing boats are expected to land about 100,000 tonnes of fish this season. This quantity is about a quarter of the total allowable catch in the New Zealand 200-mile zone.

Still Room For Expansion

To a large degree, the joint ventures have been a stepping stone towards deep-water expansion. But as the local fishermen press for a greater role, fishing companies and others have to consider if it is economically possible to replace the big foreign boats with local craft and crews.

The Fishing Industry Board has been critical of past fragmented planning, and has now undertaken the task of producing some base documents.

One of the early mistakes was to allow the growth of the local fishing fleet to outstrip that of shore processing facilities.

Another was that too many big boats imported under duty-free schemes were put to work in already hard-pressed inshore waters. The result is that established, profitable fisheries have come under intense pressure and less-developed waters still offer room for expansion.

The Fishing Industry Board has already made some decisions on the sort of craft needed for deep-sea fishing.

It believes that most foreign craft now employed in these waters are too large and inefficient and it has recommended certain engine sizes, types of propellers and dimensions which are more suited to local conditions.

Processing In Port

The foreign boats now used in local waters were not necessarily designed for New Zealand conditions and many are old craft which have outlived their usefulness in other waters.

There was some disappointment that the Soviet Union did not provide more modern trawlers for its joint-venture partners in New Zealand.

The Russian 1000-tonners used for catching squid and fin fish such as oreo dory and roughie are old side trawlers which are marginally economic for fin-fish trawling, according to Sanford Ltd, which has a number on charter in joint ventures.

If local boats fish the deep waters they will not require the range, duration, or the same fish-hold capacity as foreign boats because much of the processing will be done at ports only a day or two away from the fishing grounds.

The foreign boats were built to carry and process their catches, frequently on voyages of 6000 or 7000 miles and up to four or five months' duration. That meant carrying more stores, fuel and extra crew to work the boats and to process catches.

The New Zealand fishing industry will require a flexibility of operations.

Some inshore waters worked at present by small trawlers and Danish seiners could be fished by multi-purpose trawlers capable of fishing the Chatham Rise during the winter months when prime species fish, such as snapper, are not particularly abundant.

A number of inshore fisheries, such as the Hauraki Gulf, may become controlled fisheries where either catches or fishing effort are restricted to a limited number of licensed boats.

In its deliberations on the most efficient way of fishing deeper waters, the Fishing Industry Board has to take into account the many and varied factions to avoid unnecessary conflict of interest and competition.

The general manager of Sanford Ltd, Mr N. L. Mills, says that no fishing companies are prepared to make heavy investment in deep-sea boats at present, because the risks are too great and interest rates offered by the Government for new craft are unfavourable.

He said fishermen were disappointed that the last budget did not include secondhand fishing boats in the scheme which offers attractive terms for buying new craft overseas.

Overseas there are many good boats up for sale in the $2 million to $3 million range and some of the big local companies are interested in them.

Big Craft Too Costly?

Local fishermen have different ideas on the types and sizes of boats which they feel are best suited to New Zealand fishing and the board has to reconcile some of the differences.

One school of thought believes the deep-water boats do not need the capacity to freeze fish and that they should make regular, short voyages and land fresh fish.

The other opinion is that this idea is impractical for voyages to places like the Chatham Rise, and that local processing factories could not cope with sporadic, big loads of fresh fish.

There seems to be general agreement that local deep-sea trawlers do not need to process fish to the same degree that most foreign boats do.

Price and income stabilisation schemes have already been requested by various sections of the local industry.

Trade union attitudes on manning, processing and handling catches have to be clarified and certain guarantees will almost certainly have to be given before investments are made.

Present indications are that there are as many conflicts between joint-venture boats and local fishermen as there were between local fishermen and foreign boats in the days before the 200-mile zone.

Conflicting Interests

There are conflicting interests between locals and joint-venture operators over the West Coast hake and hoki grounds because both want to fish this area.

Similar conflicts have arisen over squid fishing around Nelson and trawling off the east coast of the South Island.

There are now arguments about joint-venture catches displacing local catches in New Zealand and on established markets in Australia.

With these problems in mind, the Fishing Industry Board will have to resolve the present problems to satisfy both parties or recommend a total takeover of joint ventures by local fishing boats.

When the Government comes to its deliberations on the board's plan, it will have to be satisfied that local fishermen can do the job economically and that it does not cause undue hardship to the nations which depend on New Zealand fish.

CSO: 5200

LOCAL FISHERMEN OPPOSE JOINT VENTURE FISHING FOR HAKE

Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 2 Jul 80 p 12

[Text] New Zealand fishermen would believe massive pressure on the Minister was behind the Government's decision on hake fishing, a domestic fishing industry spokesman said yesterday.

The Federation of Commercial Fishermen's liaison officer (Mr Ian McWhannell) said in Nelson that New Zealand fishermen would be very disappointed that joint-venture vessels were still allowed to fish the hake fishery off the West Coast, the Press Association reported.

Fishermen could only believe that massive pressure was put on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr MacIntyre) by a few New Zealanders, numbering perhaps only six or seven, who worked for overseas companies, he said.

On Monday the Government gazetted regulations setting a 3000 tonne quota on the industry and giving local vessels a 14-day advantage over joint-venture vessels.

Announcing the decision, Mr MacIntyre said joint venture vessels would be allowed back into the hake zone after the initial period, assuming the 3000 tonnes had not been fully taken by local vessels, though on their return they might fish only in waters outside the 650 metre depth line in the controlled zone.

Mr McWhannell said New Zealand fishermen had been encouraged to think big and move into new, bigger methods of fishing which demanded greater capital.

The most significant factor in fishing was the conflict between smaller New Zealand boats and the larger New Zealand boats.

With the hake grounds, this could have been resolved if it had been left to New Zealand boats. The larger boats could have taken the grounds further out, leaving the inshore grounds to the smaller boats, thus relieving the pressure on the inshore grounds.

In Wellington, the general manager of the Fishing Industry Board (Mr Nick Jarman) said the board, which represented both domestic fishermen and the joint ventures in the process of becoming New Zealand operations, recognised the need for a compromise this season, though it would have preferred a longer period for the domestic fleet on its own.

He said there were uncertainties over what depth the hake would be caught at, over the capability of the domestic fleet, and over whether the weather would be good enough for the domestic fleet to take a substantial quantity of the fish.

"It was because of these uncertainties as to the domestic fleet's capabilities that the Goverment decided on this compromise," Mr Jarman said.

But if the fish were not caught because of bad weather in the 14-day period, the domestic fishermen would feel they had been disadvantaged, he said.

If the domestic fleet proved itself capable of making a substantial catch, it would be only appropriate that it be given preference, rather than the relatively new-coming joint venture vessels, he said.

CSO: 5200

TWO OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING PROGRAMS ANNOUNCED

South Island West Coast

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 15 Jul 80 Sec 2 p 5

/Text/ New Zealand Petroleum Co Ltd plans to begin a drilling programme off the West Coast of the South Island by the end of the coming summer.

The chairman, Mr C. C. Shepherd, told the Herald this last night after the Minister of Energy, Mr Birch, announced the company had been granted a prospecting licence for five years from last Friday.

The area to be searched is part of one for which NZ Petroleum held licences previously.

The minister said the licence provided for seismic work and the drilling of at least one test well. He understood the company was anxious to start work as soon as possible.

Petroleum Corporation of New Zealand Ltd (Petrocorp), the Government company, would not be involved.

Mr Shepherd said the summer start was set because NZ Petroleum would need about nine months' lead time for arrangements such as assuring supplies of necessary pipe.

It already had discussed with Shell-BP-Todd hiring the consortium's rig, which was moving to Taranaki West Coast waters now.

Depending on progress with the first well, NZ Petroleum might consider further drilling.

Initially, the search would cost between $5 million and $6 million.

NZ Petroleum has, as an affiliate, Triton Oil and Gas Inc. of Dallas, with this American company engaged internationally in oil and natural gas exploration and development investment.

Off Taranaki Coast

Christchurch THE PRESS in English 15 Jul 80 p 21

[Text] Wellington--A $40 million Shell-BP-Todd offshore oil exploration programme is expected to get underway in mid-September, only 2 weeks before the oil-exploration license in the area expires.

However, the Minister of Energy (Mr Birch) is believed to have given the consortium an undertaking that the expiry of the licence will not delay the programme.

The consortium holds a licenced area round the coast of Taranaki and are almost a year of trying to find a drilling ship, announced that it had obtained the services of Sedco's sophisticated drill ship S-445.

A Shell spokesman Mr John Humphries, said [illegible] the S-445 was due to arrive off the coast in mid-September. She was likely to begin work immediately and it is possible that she would not even need to call at the port of New Plymouth.

Mr Humphries said the ship would drill three wells. One would go down near the Maui platform, and two others north of New Plymouth.

Mr Humphries said the consortium had experienced considerable difficulties in obtaining a drilling ship and as a result had run up against the licence-expiration date.

Approaches had been made to the minister, who had indicated that the drilling programme would not be handicapped by the licence problem.

Government sources have confirmed that the oil search was considered too important to be held up by formal delays. However, they said that under the amended Petroleum Act it was legally impossible to extend the Shell-BP-Todd licence.

The act permitted one extension and the consortium had already taken this.

Shell-BP-Todd will now have to file a new application.

CSO: 5200

OIL POLLUTION CONTROL CRAFT TO FIGHT TANKER SPILLS

Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 3 Jul 80 p 3

[Text]

An incongruous craft will soon mingle with Marsden Pt's powerful tugboats and massive oil tankers.

At first glance it looks like a small troop-landing barge.

But dispersing equipment and men on the beaches is only one of the important functions that the Northland Harbour Board expects its oil pollution control craft, the Mauao — the name means Grey Duck — to perform.

For the craft has become a relatively inexpensive insurance policy at around $420,000, against the risk of oil spillages that have occurred at Marsden Pt and will most probably continue to do so.

The multi-million dollar expansion of the New Zealand Refining Co plant, which will begin this year, will mean more frequent arrivals of super tankers.

The risks associated with the transfer of their cargoes is one factor which has led to the development of the Mauao.

Last year there were two spillages at Marsden Pt within two months.

After the first spill in February, the board approved the purchase of a new Swedish-designed oil boom system in conjunction with the refining company at a cost of $60,000.

The second and larger spill in March gave an insight into the possible environmental damage that could occur in the wake of a major oil spill.

The light brown crude oil stained beaches near the refinery and created an overwhelming stench. Seagulls died covered in oil and oil lapped against boats moored in the harbour.

On the first day six harbour board vessels, 40 staff and two helicopters battled to break up the oil slick with dispersants. Two days later work gangs had finally cleaned up the beaches.

The cost was over $40,000.

The aluminium Mauao is the first craft in the country to be designed specifically for controlling oil pollution.

The 12.6 metre vessel can carry 2000 litres of dispersant in built-in tanks and has a waste oil capacity of five tonnes.

Fitted with dispersant spray booms on either side, the Mauao also has twin hydrocyclone booms on the bow which collect the waste oil, separate it from the water and pump it into the holding tank.

CSO: 3200

BRIEFS

REDUCTION OF SEA LIMITS--The opposition is surprised and even concerned over the government's decision to reduce the country's territorial sea from 200 to 12 miles. We have contacted Deputy Fernando Coelho, vice president of the Brazilian Democratic Movement Party [PMDB]. [Begin recording] [Question] What will be the future position of your party regarding this issue? [Answer] We will give our full attention to this problem and once the congressional activities are resumed, we will ask the government for the appropriate explanations. We do not want a repeat of the way in which the nuclear accord was approved--that is, urgently and without a proper in-depth examination. The opposition will outline its position after hearing the explanations and examining its own beliefs. So far we are just surprised at the country's retreat from something which had been presented as [words indistinct] and a fact. [end recording.] [By Carlos Rodrigues] [Text] [PY111747 Sao Paulo Radio Bandeirantes Network in Portuguese 0230 GMT 11 Jul 80]

CSO: 5200

BRIEFS

USE OF SEA RESOURCES--In order to exploit sea resources in a rational way, the military government recently enacted a law on the use of marine resources. The law sets forth the Honduran state's sovereign, exclusive and jurisdictional rights over the exploitation, conservation and administration of natural resources, living and otherwise, found in the ocean floor, subsoil and waters located in the exclusive 200-nautical-mile economic zone. The law was drawn up by Mario Caria Zapata and Dr Roberto Herrera Caceres, Honduran delegates to the Law of the Sea Conference, and is the result of several years of study. It has been reviewed by the Natural Resources Secretariat, the Foreign Secretariat and the Honduran Navy. The law reflects the concepts generally accepted during the third law of the sea conference, those contained in the Honduran regulations on the matter and in our country's fisheries development programs. [Text] [FA241808 Tegucigalpa Domestic Service in Spanish 0400 GMT 24 Jul 80]

CSO: 3010

1980 DUMPING AT SEA CONTROL ACT ISSUED

Pretoria GOVERNMENT GAZETTE in English 4 Jun 80 pp 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15

[Text]

Vol. 1801 CAPE TOWN, 4 JUNE 1980 KAAPSTAD, 4 JUNIE 1980 No. 7961

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

No. 1149 4 June 1980

It is hereby notified that the State President has assented to the following Act which is hereby published for general information:—

No. 73 of 1980: Dumping at Sea Control Act, 1980

KANTOOR VAN DIE EERSTE MINISTER

No. 1149 4 Junie 1980

Hierby word bekend gemaak dat die Staatspresident sy goedkeuring gegee het aan die onderstaande Wet wat hierby vir algemene inligting gepubliseer word:—

No. 73 van 1980: Wet op Beheer van Storting ter See, 1980

ACT

To provide for the control of dumping of substances in the sea.

(Afrikaans text signed by the State President.)
(Assented to 27 May 1980.)

BE IT ENACTED by the State President, the Senate and the House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, as follows:—

Definitions

1. (1) In this Act, unless the context otherwise indicates—

(i) "aircraft" means airborne craft of any type whatsoever, whether self-propelled or not; (ix)

(ii) "dump", in relation to any substance, means to deliberately dispose of at sea from any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure, by incinerating or depositing in the sea, but does not include to—

(*a*) dispose at sea of any substance incidental to or derived from the normal operations of any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure and its equipment, other than dispose of any substance from any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure operated for the purpose of disposing of such substance at sea;

(*b*) lawfully deposit at sea any substance for a purpose other than the mere disposal thereof;

and "dumping" has a corresponding meaning; (vii)

(iii) "master", in relation to any vessel, means any person (other than a pilot) having charge of such vessel; (i)

(iv) "Minister" means the Minister of Industries; (iii)

(v) "pilot", in relation to any aircraft, means any person having charge of such aircraft; (ii)

(vi) "regulation" means a regulation made under section 8; (iv)

(vii) "sea" means the territorial waters of the Republic as defined in section 2 of the Territorial Waters Act, 1963 (Act No. 87 of 1963), and includes the sea between the high- and low-water marks; (v)

(viii) "Secretary" means the Secretary for Industries or any person acting under his authority; (vi)

(ix) "vessel" means waterborne craft of any type whatsoever, whether self-propelled or not. (viii)

(2) In relation to any matter affecting the Railways and Harbours Administration, the Minister shall only act in terms of this Act with the concurrence of the Minister of Transport Affairs.

Loading and dumping prohibited or restricted.

2. (1) Any person who—

(*a*) dumps any substance mentioned in Schedule 1;

(*b*) (i) dumps any substance mentioned in Schedule 2;

(ii) loads any such substance onto any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea for dumping; or

(iii) deliberately disposes at sea of any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure,

except under the authority of and in accordance with the provisions of a special permit under section 3; or

(*c*) (i) dumps any other substance; or

(ii) loads any such substance on to any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea for dumping,

except under the authority of and in accordance with the provisions of a general permit under section 3,

shall be guilty of an offence, unless the substance in question was dumped for the purpose of saving human life or of securing the safety of the vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea in question or any other vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea or of preventing damage to the vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea in question or to any other vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure at sea, and such dumping was necessary for such purpose or was a reasonable step to take in the circumstances.

(2) The onus of proving any exception, exemption or qualification contemplated in subsection (1) shall be upon the accused.

(3) If any person who commits an offence referred to in subsection (1) is not the master or owner of the vessel, or the pilot or owner of the aircraft, in question, or person in charge of or the owner of the platform or other man-made structure in question, the master of such vessel or pilot of such aircraft or person so in charge and, if he is not the owner of such vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure, also the owner thereof, shall in addition to the person who committed the said offence, be guilty of an offence, unless such master or pilot or person so in charge, and such owner, where he is not such master or pilot or person so in charge, proves that he did not permit or connive at such first-mentioned offence and that he took all reasonable measures, in addition to forbidding it, to prevent such offence being committed.

(4) The provisions of subsection (3) shall not relieve the person committing an offence referred to in subsection (1) of liability to be convicted and sentenced in respect of such offence.

(5) Where dumping has taken place in pursuance of any exception, exemption or qualification contemplated in subsection (1), the master of the vessel or the pilot of the aircraft or the person in charge of the platform or other man-made structure in question shall forthwith report such dumping to the Secretary in such manner and furnish such information in regard thereto as may be prescribed by regulation.

(6) The provisions of subsections (1) to (5) shall, in respect of any South African vessel, aircraft or citizen, apply *mutatis mutandis* also on the high seas, including the fishing zone as defined in section 3 of the Territorial Waters Act, 1963 (Act No. 87 of 1963).

(7) If any person charged with having committed an offence under subsection (1), as applied by subsection (6), is found within the area of jurisdiction of any court in the Republic which would have had jurisdiction to try the offence if it had been committed within the said area, the court shall have jurisdiction to try the offence.

(8) For the purposes of this section—

"South African aircraft" means any aircraft registered in the Republic;

"South African vessel" means any vessel registered in the Republic in terms of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1951 (Act No. 57 of 1951), or deemed to be so registered.

Permits

3. (1) After consultation with a Standing Committee consisting of persons appointed by the Minister for purposes of this section, the Secretary may on application and after taking into account the factors set out in Schedule 3, grant—

(*a*) a special permit authorizing—

(i) the dumping, on such conditions as the Secretary may think fit to attach to such permit, of any substance mentioned in Schedule 2;

(ii) the disposal at sea, on such conditions as the Secretary may think fit to attach to such permit, of any vessel, aircraft, platform or other man-made structure;

(*b*) a general permit authorizing the dumping, on such conditions as the Secretary may think fit to attach to

such permit, of any substance other than that mentioned in Schedule 1 or 2.

(2) An application for any such permit shall be made in such manner and contain such information as may be prescribed by regulation.

(3) If any person to whom any such permit has been granted is convicted of an offence referred to in section 2, the Secretary may cancel such permit or amend it by restricting the dumping or disposal authorized by it.

Report to Minister.

4. Within 30 days after the end of each calendar year the Secretary shall, as far as he is able to do so, furnish the Minister with a report regarding such year as to—

(a) the number of permits granted under section 3;

(b) the nature and quantities of all substances or articles—

(i) authorized by such permits to be dumped or disposed of at sea;

(ii) the dumping of which was reported in terms of section 2 (5);

(iii) dumped or disposed of at sea in contravention of the provisions of section 2,

and the location, time and method of the dumping or disposal in question.

Powers of inspection.

5. (1) The holder of any office designated by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* and any police official as defined in section 1 of the Criminal Procedure Act, 1977 (Act No. 51 of 1977), may—

(a) enter upon or board any place, premises, vessel or aircraft on or in which he suspects any substance which may afford evidence of a contravention of this Act is kept or loaded, inspect any such substance found on or in such place, premises, vessel or aircraft so entered upon or boarded and open or cause to be opened any article in which he suspects any such substance to be;

(b) examine all books and documents on or in any such place, premises, vessel or aircraft which he has reason to believe relate to such substance, make copies of or extracts from such books and documents and demand from the owner or custodian of any such book or document an explanation of any record or entry therein;

(c) if reasonable suspicion exists that an offence under this Act has been committed or attempted or is about to be committed or attempted from or in respect of any vessel or aircraft, require the master or pilot or owner of such vessel or aircraft to move or fly or cause to be moved or flown the vessel or aircraft to any specified harbour or airfield, or, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by regulation, detain such vessel or aircraft, pending any investigation for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The holder of any office designated under subsection (1) who acts under that subsection, shall at the request of any person affected thereby, produce such proof of his identity as may be prescribed by regulation.

(3) No customs officer authorized to grant clearance to any vessel or aircraft shall grant clearance to any vessel or aircraft while detained in terms of this section.

(4) Any person who-

(a) hinders, obstructs or assaults a person or police official referred to in subsection (1); or

(b) wilfully fails to comply with any lawful demand made by such person or official in the performance of his duties or the exercise of his powers,

shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalties.

6. (1) Any person shall be liable on conviction of—

(a) any offence under section 2 (1) *(a)*, to a fine not exceeding R250 000 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding five years or to both such fine and such imprisonment and in addition, if the offence was committed over a period of more than one day, to a fine not exceeding R5 000 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months in respect of every day during which the offence continued;

(b) any offence under section 2 (1) *(b)*, to a fine not exceeding R100 000 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding two years or to both such fine and such imprisonment and in addition, if the offence was committed over a period of more than one day, to a fine not exceeding R2 000 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding two months in respect of every day during which the offence continued;

(c) any offence under section 2 (1) *(c)* or (5) or 5 (4), to a fine not exceeding R5 000 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to both such fine and such imprisonment and in addition, in the case of an offence under section 2 (1) *(c)*, if the offence was committed over a period of more than one day, to a fine not exceeding R500 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 18 days in respect of every day during which the offence continued.

(2) Any master, pilot, owner or person in charge mentioned in section 2 (3) shall be liable on conviction of the offence under that section, where such conviction is in pursuance of an offence by any other person—

(a) under section 2 (1) *(a)*, to the penalties prescribed by subsection (1) *(a)* of this section;

(b) under section 2 (1) *(b)*, to the penalties prescribed by subsection (1) *(b)* of this section;

(c) under section 2 (1) *(c)*, to the penalties prescribed by subsection (1) *(c)* of this section in the case of an offence under section 2 (1) *(c)*.

Jurisdiction and evidence

7. (1) If any person is charged with having committed any offence under this Act on or in the sea, any court whose area of jurisdiction abuts on or includes any part of the sea may try the charge, and the offence shall, for all purposes incidental to or consequential upon the trying of the charge, be deemed to have been committed within the area of jurisdiction of the court so hearing it.

(2) In any prosecution for a contravention of this Act—

(a) based on any act alleged to have been performed in a particular area, the act in question shall be deemed to have been performed in such area;

(b) any information obtained by means of any instrument or chart used to determine any distance or depth, shall be deemed to be correct,

unless the contrary is proved.

Regulations.

8. (1) The Minister may make regulations—

(a) prescribing the form of applications for permits and other documents which may be necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of this Act;

(b) prescribing the form of such permits and documents, the periods for which they shall be valid and, after consultation with the Minister of Finance, the fees or other charges which shall be paid in connection therewith and with the said applications;

(c) prescribing the manner in which water or any other substance used for the cleaning of any vessel or aircraft may be disposed of;

(d) prescribing the signals to be used or displayed with regard to any dumping under a special or general permit granted under section 3 (1) (a) (i) or (b);

(e) as to any matters which in terms of this Act are required or permitted to be prescribed by regulation,

and, in general, as to all matters which he considers it necessary or expedient to prescribe in order that the purposes of this Act may be achieved.

(2) A regulation may prescribe penalties for any contravention of or failure to comply with its provisions, not exceeding a fine of R5 000 or imprisonment for a period of six months.

Amendment of Schedules.

9. The Minister may from time to time by notice in the *Gazette* amend any Schedule to this Act by any inclusion therein or deletion therefrom.

Operation of Act in relation to other laws.

10. The provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other law which is not in conflict with or inconsistent with this Act.

Application of Act.

11. This Act and any amendment thereof shall apply also in respect of the Prince Edward Islands as described in section 1 of the Prince Edward Islands Act, 1948 (Act No. 43 of 1948).

Short title and commencement.

12. This Act shall be called the Dumping at Sea Control Act, 1980, and shall come into operation on a date fixed by the State President by proclamation in the *Gazette*.

Schedule 1

(Section 2)

PROHIBITED SUBSTANCES

1. Organohalogen compounds.
2. Mercury and its compounds.
3. Cadmium and its compounds.
4. Persistent plastics and other persistent synthetic materials.
5. High-level radio-active waste or other high-level radio-active matter prescribed by regulation with the concurrence of the Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs.
6. Substances in whatever form produced for biological and chemical warfare.

Schedule 2
(Section 2)

RESTRICTED SUBSTANCES

1. Arsenic and its compounds.
2. Lead and its compounds.
3. Copper and its compounds.
4. Zinc and its compounds.
5. Organosilicon compounds.
6. Cyanides.
7. Fluorides.
8. Pesticides and their by-products not included in Schedule 1
9. Beryllium and its compounds.
10. Chromium and its compounds.
11. Nickel and its compounds.
12. Vanadium and its compounds.
13. Containers, scrap metal and any substances or articles that by reason of their bulk may interfere with fishing or navigation.
14. Radio-active waste or other radio-active matter not included in Schedule 1
15. Ammunition.

Schedule 3
(Section 3)

FACTORS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN GRANTING PERMITS

A. CHARACTERISTICS AND COMPOSITION OF SUBSTANCE

1. Total amount and average composition of substance dumped (such as per year).
2. Form—whether solid, sludge, liquid or gaseous.
3. Properties, namely, physical (such as solubility and density), chemical and biochemical (such as oxygen demand, nutrients) and biological (such as presence of viruses, bacteria, yeasts and parasites).
4. Toxicity.
5. Persistence, namely, physical, chemical and biological.
6. Accumulation and biotransformation in biological materials or sediments.
7. Susceptibility to physical, chemical and biochemical changes and interaction in the aquatic environment with other dissolved organic and inorganic materials.
8. Probability of production of taints or other changes reducing marketability of resources such as fish and shellfish.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF DUMPING OR DISPOSAL SITE AND METHOD OF DEPOSIT

1. Location (such as co-ordinates of the dumping or disposal area, depth and distance from the coast) and location in relation to other areas (such as amenity areas, spawning, nursery and fishing areas and exploitable resources).
2. Rate of disposal per specific period (such as quantity per day, per week, per month).
3. Methods of packaging and containment, if any.
4. Initial dilution achieved by proposed method of release.
5. Disposal characteristics (such as effects of currents, tides and wind on horizontal transport and vertical mixing).
6. Water characteristics (such as temperature, pH, salinity, stratification, oxygen indices of pollution—dissolved oxygen (DO), chemical oxygen demand (COD), biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), nitrogen present in organic and mineral form, including ammonia, suspended matter, other nutrients and productivity).
7. Bottom characteristics (such as topography, geochemical and geological characteristics and biological productivity).
8. Existence and effects of other dumpings or disposals which have been made in the dumping or disposal area (such as heavy metal background reading and organic carbon content).
9. Existence, if any, of adequate scientific basis for assessing the consequences of the dumping or disposal for which permit is sought, as outlined in this Schedule, taking into account seasonal variations.

C. General Considerations

1. Possible effects on amenities (such as presence of floating or stranded material, turbidity, objectionable odour, discoloration and foaming)
2. Possible effects on marine life, fish and shellfish culture, fish stocks and fisheries, seaweed harvesting and culture
3. Possible effects on other uses of the sea (such as impairment of water quality for industrial use, underwater corrosion of structures, interference with ship operations from floating substances, interference with fishing or navigation through deposit of waste or solid objects on the sea floor and protection of areas of special importance for scientific or conservation purposes)
4. The practical availability of alternative land-based methods of treatment, disposal or elimination, or of treatment to render the matter less harmful for dumping or disposal at sea.

CSO: 5200

FINLAND-SWEDEN COMMISSION WARNS: BOTHNIA SALMON ENDANGERED

Helsinki HUFVUDSBLADET in Swedish 2 Jul 80 p 1

[Text] The salmon catches in the Baltic Sea region have reached such proportions that the natural salmon production is threatened, the Finnish-Swedish boundary river commission writes to the governments of Finland and Sweden.

The commission considers that significant cutbacks must be brought about in Baltic fishing to prevent very serious, possibly irreparable damages to the natural salmon production.

The commission therefore desires that the governments of Finland and Sweden present that question strongly at the Baltic Sea Commission's meeting in Warsaw from 17 to 27 September.

The number of growing salmon fry in the Torne river is only a third of what it was a number of years ago. Formerly there were also many female fish there. That is reported by Jorma Toivonen, fil.lic. [licentiate in philosophy], of the Fisheries Research Institute. The Torne boundary river commission's view that the salmon take from the Baltic should be reduced is therefore understandable.

The situation is similar in the Simojoki. The upper part of the river in particular is getting empty. The situation in the Torne's tributaries on the Swedish side, i.e. in the Lainionjoki, Muonio, and Könkämeno rivers, is beginning to be disturbing.

The International Baltic Fisheries Commission has asked for a recommendation on the salmon catch in the Baltic from the International Oceanographic Council. The study group that investigated the matter earlier presumes that the catch will be definitely reduced.

8815
CSO: 5200

FRG FEELS ITS INTERESTS WILL BE IGNORED AT LOS CONFERENCE

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 22 Jul 80 p 9

[Article by Klaus Broichhausen: "Planned Economy for the World's Oceans?"]

[Text] It looks bad for the FRG at the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference. The FRG Government is trying to salvage whatever can still be saved. It must cooperate in a new international convention against the law of the jungle and a lack of order in the world's oceans, knowing full well that the FRG will lose a great deal in the process.

Since 1973, a bitter struggle for distributing the oceans has been taking place under the very professional sounding name of the Law of the Sea Conference. As a result, 70 percent of the earth's surface will be redistributed. This largest and longest conference of all times, involving 163 countries, is supposed to provide new regulations for using the sea and the sea floor. An all-encompassing system of laws for shipping, fishing, ocean research, environmental protection and deep sea mining is being established.

This Monday the mammoth conference will enter its decisive phase in Geneva. The present result of the negotiations is supposed to be tied down or, as the diplomats call it, "formalized." The text of the conference is not yet formally binding but it is already politically very strong. Bonn had considerable effort in finding allies to prevent a catastrophe. The Western industrial nations are not negotiating as a unified front because they have different interests in the reordering of the oceans. The negotiation fronts run criss-cross. The common gridding at other conferences of North-South, industrial countries-developing countries does not apply to this conference.

At this redistribution conference, the FRG is among the losers for two reasons: Its economic interests are not respected sufficiently, in part even grossly disregarded. The respected principles of the market economy and of a free-world trade have been thrown overboard. The sea conference has been driven more and more in the direction of dirigism in the course of the past few years.

The German interests are not given their due because our geographic position is so unfavorable. The FRG only has a piece of the coast and, therefore, cannot lay any large claim to ocean areas. The countries with extended shorelines, on the other hand, will be the winners of the Law of the Sea Conference. Most of them have occupied the area beyond their coastline--up to 200 nautical miles into the ocean--without paying any attention to the existing Law of the Sea. This largest occupation of property in the history of mankind is even supposed to be sanctioned by the new convention. A small group of states with a long coastline will receive vested and exclusive fishing rights and the right to exploit oil, gas and mineral deposits in a 200-nautical mile economic zone. Even more: Even the subterranean mountains in the middle of the oceans are supposed to be nationalized as mainland headstarts. As a result, 20 to 30 countries with long coastlines will be accorded 40 percent of the world's oceans. They are supposed to receive controlling rights over shipping not only in their sovereign waters, which have been extended from 3 to 12 nautical miles, but also in the economic zone. There as well, ocean research will only be possible with the permission of the coastal country.

The freedom of the seas, already commended in the 17th century by Hugh Grotius, one of the first law of the sea experts, has ultimately come to an end. The broad usage rights and powers of authority of the countries having coastlines are markedly contradictory to the requirement of the United Nations for treating the ocean as the common inheritance of mankind. The wealth of the oceans not allocated to countries having a long coastline is supposed to fall under the strict control of an ocean mining agency of the United Nations.

The developing countries want to keep their hopes high with at least this remainder of the "common inheritance." They want to secure a sufficient proportion of the tempting deposits of copper, nickel, cobalt and manganese on the ocean floor by the fact that these minerals will be administered internationally and will be mined by their own mining enterprise of the ocean agency. The industrial countries are supposed to finance this with a variety of contributions and payments as well as with an inexpensive, mandatory transfer of technical knowhow. Competition between land and ocean mining is supposed to be excluded by production limitations so that the prices of the raw materials producers are not negatively influenced by the deep sea mining. It is characteristic for the conflict of interests among the industrial nations that Australia and Canada, having rich reserves in raw materials--especially as producers of nickel--support this demand of the Third World for production controls.

This is a dangerous plan for a world raw materials bureaucracy by means of which the markets of important raw materials are supposed to be controlled at the expense of the consumers. The majority of the Law of the Sea Conference would like to regulate and stratulate ocean mining to such an extent that it would not be at all lucrative any more for private companies.

Taxes on ocean minerals, as were also recommended by the North-South Commission under the direction of SPD Chairman Brandt, would discriminate deep sea mining even more and would create windfall profits for the land-based producers.

The raw materials dirigists of the Third World want to expand the ocean agency into a monopoly with enormous powers because in this way, for the first time--recognized by international law--they could practice the planned "new economic order" proposed by them on a large scale. If the industrial nations would also tolerate a monopolistic ocean mining agency following the first political concessions with respect to raw materials at the World Trade and Development Conference (UNCTAD), then a precedent would be created for placing more and more markets under a dirigistic order. It would be equivalent to a dam burst if the industrial nations at the Law of the Sea Conference committed themselves to transfer technology to the Third World at a certain discount price.

The FRG Government cannot agree to such an "ocean floor regime." Our country, which is poor in raw materials, requires an equal, calculated access to the treasures on the ocean floor. German industry involved in ocean technology, which has a leading position, cannot be coerced into simply handing out its technology advantage to the agency or to the developing countries. If the industrial nations are supposed to make their technology available under special conditions, then the possibility of their being overruled in the council of the ocean agency must be prevented. The FRG Government is devoting its primary efforts to changes in the negotiated text on this serious question. It must insist on the fact that the conference will take the time for this question even if the developing countries and individual partners as well become increasingly impatient for a conclusion.

9527
CSO: 3200

'DIE WELT' ASSES LS POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF LAW OF SEA

DW311105 Bonn DIE W'LT in German 30 Jul 80 p 7

[Heinz Heck article: "Germany Is Surely One of the Big Losers"]

[Text] At the Third Law of the Sea Conference a comprehensive system of international law is being sought which will regulate shipping, fishing, oceanographic research, environmental protection and mining on the ocean floor. The Federal Government believes that the convention, as represented in the Informal Composite Negotiation Text (ICNT), has already largely been established. With regard to the question of the ocean floor there is still some elbow room for negotiations, even though developing countries, above all, are pushing in a direction which appears to be unacceptable for the Federal Republic.

It is precisely here that new ground is a stake in both technological as well as juridical respects in a field whose great economic significance has only recently come to the fore during the course of the conference itself and which overshadows other issues today.

Apart from this, a kind of "war by proxy" is to be waged in this field with a view to ward implementing a large number of elements of the "new world economic order" which are demanded by the developing countries. The initial solution to this new order is marked by state control, whereas the one which is predominantly now is that of the market economy, except for segments such as the agricultural sector.

Another impediment is the fact that some industrial countries with pronounced interests in terrestrial mining, particularly Canada, are pursuing an obstructionist strategy. What matters to them above all is that the manganese nodules from the ocean depths, which also contain cobalt, nickel and copper, do not seriously compete with their own mining. At any rate, a petition from the Federation of Chambers of German Industry and Commerce (DIHT) to the Federal Ministries of Economics and Foreign Affairs says the present negotiating results on the planned ocean floor program appears to be "unacceptable for reasons affecting policies dealing with the world economy, order, raw materials and technology." What should be the objective is to provide all states and their companies with free, equal and legally secured access to these raw materials (including their exploitation, transportation and smelting.

In this the industrialized countries acknowledge that since they possess the prerequisites for the extraction of mineral resources from the ocean floor the developing countries must also be given the opportunity (in technical and financial respects) to participate in this "joint heritage of mankind."

It is for this reason that the "parallel system" has been devised, meaning the existence side by side of an "enterprise" which holds authority over the ocean floor along with the state as well as private enterprises of individual countries. DIHT however, fears that in the meantime the parallel system has been weakened to the advantage of the ocean floor authority through a large number of stipulations. This seems to be indicated, among other things, by the following stipulations that are to be included in the Law of the Sea Convention.

The authority is to participate in negotiations on international raw materials agreements, where it will represent the entire deep-sea production.

It is to be authorized to determine "appropriate" conditions and methods for the mining of other (than manganese nodules) raw materials as well. Thereby it would already be granted control over resources whose existence and significance cannot be foreseen as yet.

At a revisory conference (which presumably is to take place 15 years after the convention has become effective the enterprise of the authority might receive a monopoly position.

It is to be feared that the authority's raw materials policy could become the starting point and cornerstone of a comprehensive raw materials bureaucracy. This would eliminate competition between deep-sea mining and terrestrial production. Ore production from manganese nodules would then function merely as a "buffer" for regulating the raw material markets.

This is the direction also aimed at by the coupling of manganese nodule production with terrestrial nickel production (already accepted by a majority) which was proposed by Canada, an important nickel producer.

If such an arrangement were to be achieved, then raw material have-nots--be they industrialized or developing countries--will remain in their present state of dependence and the headway made heretofore by German enterprises, for example in the field of marine mining technology, would be of no use.

Thus the architects of the conference, as far as they aim at a monopoly-like position of the authority, logically call for compulsory technology transfer (from the companies to the "enterprise"). During the current state of negotiations, no distinction is being made as to whether legally protected equipment or methods are at stake or not or whether third technologies are involved (meaning that technology which the company engaged in undersea mining has acquired through purchase from another company. Whenever equal conditions are not conceded to the "enterprise" then the other companies will also not be allowed to utilize this technology.

These few examples already show that everything is done so as to impede the exploitation of this promising raw materials source; this ultimately can only result in a generally higher price level for raw materials. It is rather doubtful whether this is advantageous in the view of the Third World, which after all wants to conquer a 25 percent share in world industrial production by the year 2000, because many of these countries are as dependent upon imports as, for instance, Japan and the Federal Republic.

It seems to be likewise doubtful as to whether the planned financial contribution to commercially run ocean floor mining will prove to be advantageous. But after all, Minister of Economic Cooperation Rainer Offergeld (SPD) has already justified and loomed the expediency of the international fees which were demanded by the North-South mission (chairman: Willy Brandt) by referring to the settlement planned in this aspect

It is precisely the Federal Republic that has a legitimate interest that German firms not only utilize their technological knowledge, which they acquired after large investment, but also that they be in a position to advance as unhampered as possible in their research work. This is why the Bundestag early in July passed a law "on the preliminary regulation of deep sea mining." Apart from some negative votes by leftist SPD members, this law met with the approval of the whole house.

The starting signal for the German Parliament was the coming into force of a corresponding American law in June. On this explosive matter the German parliament did not want to step out of the political shelter of the Americans. Other countries interested in undersea mining, such as Britain, France, Italy and Japan are planning similar steps.

The German law envisages the possibility of commercially utilizing mineral resources from the deep sea as of January 1988. Thus prospecting and exploration can continue. Reciprocity is to be agreed upon with states which also pass national laws. This is to prevent as much as possible international lawsuits and to guarantee to the holder of a permit the exclusive utilization right, irrespective of his nationality.

The more that states pass national laws, the greater is the de facto legal effect of such regulations after a possible coming into force of the international convention. The more companies that participate in undersea mining, the smaller certainly will be the risk that the Authority will prevail with its abstructionist strategy. Up to now, however, the danger does not seem to have been banished at all. The tug-of-war is still in full swing.

Jokingly but appropriately CDU expert Peter Kittelmann described the Second Law of the Sea Conference as the "biggest land robbery at sea in the history of mankind." Today it is already taken for granted that the convention, which will be effective some day, will sanction littoral control of 12 nautical miles of coastal waters, 200 nautical miles of exclusive economic zones and even more far-reaching shares in continental shelfs. This could entail roughly two dozen states with extended coastlines dividing roughly 40 percent of the sea surface among themselves. Apart from the aforementioned restrictions, the principle of the freedom of the seas would be valid only over a considerably smaller area, and this would apply in regional respects as well.

As a result of the extension of coastal waters, more than 100 straits which hitherto had been open shipping routes will be under the control of those countries adjacent to the sea lanes. The DIHT said this is not the only, albeit a particularly spectacular consequence of the new Law of the Sea. Granted, the states bordering on the sea would be confronted with the obligation to allow the "innocent passage" (the translation should be "harmless") of ships. Yet the DIHT is afraid that this innocence lends itself to a one-sided interpretation despite the convention.

It further sees the danger that the freedom of shipping might become the exception to the rule whose framework would be more specifically defined by the soverign right of the coastal states. But viewed from the angle of shipping and of foreign trade, the point at issue now must be to preserve the high seas character to the greatest extent possible, at least in the economic zones.

The curtailment of the freedom of shipping and thus the special privileges of the coastal states should be defined at the conference unequivocally and finally so as to prevent discrimination. It may well be that the new law of the sea relevent for shipping will not be determined by the convention but only through the practice of handing down verdicts by the international court which is competent for settling quarrels.

The new convention has not as yet been completely formulated. The points of dispute are still profound and numerous. Yet, by now the winners and losers of the conference have largely been determined. Winners above all are the states with long coasts in general and those with an extensive shelf in particular. The Federal Republic is among the definite losers. In this connection the Federal Government cannot be spared the accusation that it failed to attach to the conference the attention it deserves, especially in view of the German interests (poverty in raw materials and great technical potential, with a poor starting position as a result of short coastline).

In nine rounds of negotiations since 1973 no German foreign minister ever stepped onto the slippery floor of this conference, which can be called mammoth in every respect, so as to provide the German delegation, well staffed by experts, with more political weight as well.

In this connection the argument does not hold water that this is not customary. It could have been politically useful over an 8-year period. After all, Kissinger also showed the flag at the conference and the United States is in an incomparably stronger negotiating position than the Federal Republic. Beyond that the U.S. delegation has in Elliot Richardson a man at its top who had already been his country's secretary of commerce, attorney general and under secretary of state and who is considered to be among the prominent figures of the Republicans.

The political disadvantages of the German negotiating position have been accepted rather than taking a plunge forward. Meanwhile, this conference is leading up to a completely new distribution of political weight in the world.

CSO: 5200

END

END OF FICHE

DATE FILMED

8-18-80

D.D.